



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

priest whose functions are national. The former may be, and sometimes is, a chief, but his supernatural abilities are not at the basis of his secular leadership. On the contrary they are a mere appanage or "accident" of his position, while either heredity, or wealth, bravery, sagacity, and all those virtues which bring power to individuals in civilized society are the real bases of his authority. The priestly functions, being tribal in character, lend themselves to union with civil chieftainship much more readily, but in few instances can the original functions of the priest-king be shown to have been purely ecclesiastical, and in any case it is by no means certain that the priest has evolved out of the shaman.

The supposed "evolution" of society from a maternal to a paternal stage noticed incidentally has no better foundation than the two theories already considered. The fact is that some tribes are organized on a maternal basis, some on a paternal basis, while a very large number, and of these many which on other grounds would ordinarily be considered the lowest, are properly neither the one nor the other but partake of both. Nor is there the slightest reason, beyond subservience to a widespread and popular theory, for supposing that the last have altered from any other condition.

It is to be feared that there has been a too great tendency among some anthropologists to segregate the phenomena presented by lower races and pick out certain elements as "primitive" for no better reason than because they do not occur or have been largely suppressed in our present so called "higher" culture. We thus assume our own culture as an infallible standard of comparison and everything outside as "primitive" in proportion as it diverges therefrom. It is much the same as if we were to assume that because the brain appears to be the seat of intelligence the growth of an individual had begun with the bones. For such phenomena as magic and belief in zoic or anthropomorphic beings do not show themselves successively, but are altogether contemporaneous, and if the above method of reasoning were followed, it would be possible, by a judicious selection of phenomena, to prove anything. The same may be said of the evolution of the kingship and of society in general.

JOHN R. SWANTON.

*The Secret of the Totem.* By ANDREW LANG. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1905. 12°, 225 pp.

In spite of the noted contributions of Mr Lewis H. Morgan and other Americans to the question of the evolution of human society, this subject has always been much more vigorously discussed in England than

on this side of the Atlantic. But while the works of many English students, such as Spencer and Gillen, Howitt, Fison, and Haddon, certainly contain priceless scientific contributions to the study, apparently additional data have not served to set many of the ultimate questions at rest, and in fact we seem to have a different theory for every new investigator. The book before us is that of a special pleader for one such theory, and he proceeds, as might be expected, by first discussing and refuting opposing theories and then stating his own opinions and his reasons for considering them as involving the true explanation.

The opposing theories referred to are epitomized as follows on pages 31 and 32 :

“(a) Members of certain recognized human groups already married habitually out of their group into other groups, *before* the animal names (now totem names) were given to the groups. The names came later and merely marked, at first, and then sanctioned, the limits within which marriage had already been forbidden while the groups were still nameless.

“Or (b) the animal names of the phratries and totem kins existed (perhaps as denoting groups which worked magic for the behoof of each animal) *before* marriage was forbidden within their limits. Later, for some reason, prohibitions were enacted.

“Or (c) at one time there were no marriage regulations at all, but these arose when, apparently for some religious reason, a hitherto undivided communal horde split into two sections, each of which revered a different name-giving animal as their ‘god’ (totem), claimed descent from it, and out of respect to their ‘god,’ did not marry any of those who professed its faith, and were called by its name, but always married persons of *another* name and ‘god.’

“Or (d) men were at first in groups, intermarrying within the group. These groups received names from animals and other objects, because individual men adopted animal ‘familiar,’ as Bear, Elk, Duck, Potato, Pine-tree. The sisters of the men next adopted these animal or vegetable ‘familiar,’ or protective creatures, from their brothers, and bequeathed them, by female descent, to their children. These children became groups bearing such names as Bear, Potato, Duck, and so on. These groups made treaties of marriage with each other, for political reasons of acquiring strength by union. The treaties declared that Duck should never marry Duck, but always Elk, and *vice versa*. This was exogamy, instituted for political purposes, to use the word ‘political’ proleptically.

“Or (e) men were at first in a promiscuous incestuous horde, but, perceiving the evils of this condition (whatever these evils might be taken to be), they divided it into two halves [*sic*], of which one must never marry within itself, but always in the other. To these divisions animal names were given ;

they are the phratries. They threw off colonies, or accepted other groups, which took new animal names, and are now the totem kins.

"Finally, in (*f*) conjectures (*a*) and (*c*) may be combined thus: groups of men, still nameless as groups, had for certain reasons the habit of not marrying within themselves, but, after receiving animal names, they developed an idea that the animal of each group was its kinsman, and that, for a certain superstitious reason, it was even more wrong than it had been before, to marry 'within the blood' of the animal, as, for Emu to marry Emu. Or (*f*<sub>2</sub>) the small groups did marry within themselves till, after receiving animal names, they evolved the superstition that such marriage was a sin against the animals, and so become exogamous."

This last theory (*f*<sub>1</sub> and *f*<sub>2</sub>) is Mr Lang's; (*b*) was suggested by Prof. Baldwin Spencer and Mr J. G. Frazer, and is accepted by Mr Howitt; (*c*) is that of Dr Durkheim; (*d*) is that of Mr Hill-Tout, while (*e*) is that formerly held by Mr Howitt.

It would, of course, be entirely impossible to follow Mr Lang in his discussion 'of the rival hypotheses without reproducing a large part of his work, but since he assumes so largely the character of a critic he will hardly deem it unfair if we treat his own theory in the same critical manner.

In the first place we may say that we are pleased and refreshed to find an English sociologist cutting free from the erstwhile popular notion of an undifferentiated primitive horde with promiscuous intercourse between the sexes out of which comes a matrimonial cosmos via the tortuous path of group marriage, polyandry, polygamy, etc. In his abandonment of all this and his advocacy of numbers of small local groups as the primitive state of society Mr Lang is much to be commended.

He is not so happy, however, when he attempts to account for exogamy among those groups. In adopting Darwin's suggestion that they have arisen from the custom among male anthropoid apes of fighting for supremacy in each band and killing or driving off the vanquished, he appears to be treading on very thin ice. Certainly we do not know of any human form of society in which a custom at all like this obtains, nor is it easy to see how a jealousy contest could pass over so readily into a voluntary custom. If a tendency to marry out of the group is inherited, why not a tendency to fight all the other males within it before doing so? Why do not the males in the group regard each other as mortal enemies? Far from this being the case, the males in a clan or band such as is supposed to be evolved in this manner, consider each other as "friends" and in time of trouble stand or fall together.

Furthermore, this special theory, and indeed Mr Lang's entire hypothesis, rests on the assumption that the maternal form of social organization is everywhere prior to the paternal. As he does this largely for the reason that no English ethnologists, when the major part of this book was written, admitted a contrary opinion, not so much fault can be found with him personally. It might be well to inform him, however, that, if we are to understand by a maternal system the clan systems of southeastern Australia and of America, the position is one from which American students of the younger generation will certainly dissent. The reviewer has taken this subject up in a brief contribution to the *American Anthropologist* and hopes to elaborate the evidence later. Suffice it to say (1) that the maternally organized tribes in that portion of North America embraced in the United States and the British territories are precisely those which are in other particulars most advanced, and (2) that areas occupied by maternally organized tribes appear to have been gaining on the others previous to white contact. Does either of these circumstances argue anything "primitive" in the maternally organized clan?

Another noteworthy point and one which will strike American students of Indian society with astonishment, is Mr Lang's apparent inability to understand the method of inheriting property under a clan system with female descent. He thinks, it appears, that there is no proof that a man conveys his badge to his sister's children. This statement will certainly amuse anyone who has studied the tribes of the north Pacific coast for a single month—I might almost say for a single week. A badge, name, or any mark of distinction obtained by any male among the Haida, Tlingit, and Tsimshian, for example, passes to his sister's son and is, or may be, continued on in this manner indefinitely. The contrary can hardly be maintained without accusing every anthropologist who has worked in this area of falsifying the facts.

American views of the origin of totemism, instead of being embodied in the main part of the work, are treated in an appendix in which Mr Hill-Tout appears as the principal American champion.

We believe that many of the difficulties which Mr Lang and Mr Hill-Tout experience in arguing together are due to the fact that each is attempting to explain the origin of social institutions everywhere by reference to a specific region. Of this offense the English school of sociologists must be held especially culpable, for they have been the earliest and longest offenders. Had they devoted their energies to a solution of the origin of totemism among Australian tribes, using mater-

ial from other parts of the world simply as suggestions, much more good might have been accomplished, and American students could take little exception to their work. But when the thesis is set up, as it seems to be by the above writer, that in determining the social evolution of a few tribes in southeastern Australia the question of social evolution all over the world has been put at rest, Mr Hill-Tout or any other sociologist has the right to call a halt. While not attempting to support the latter gentleman in all his contentions, which have resulted, however, from most praiseworthy investigations among the Salish tribes of British Columbia, the following points may decidedly be affirmed: (1) There is every evidence that the crests of the Haida, Tlingit, Tsimshian, and Heiltsuk originated from chiefs who transmitted them to their nephews, and proof nearly absolute that some of them were so obtained. (2) While it is not always certain that these crests came from personal manitus, the method by which most of them are said to have been acquired is identical with the method of acquirement of the personal manitu. (3) Though these crests may be said to be distinct from totems, in some tribes, notably the Tlingit, their manner of occurrence resembles in a remarkable manner the occurrence of totems. The fact that totems are found where the personal manitu is wanting need not trouble us, for the personal manitu in its typical form is also wanting among tribes on the north Pacific coast. Some having become hereditary may have tended to extinguish the use of others.

Phratry names in this area originated in an antiquity too remote for us now to penetrate, and by the people themselves they are carried back to the beginning of all things. It may be interesting for Mr Lang to know, however, that the Raven crest among the Haida is on the Eagle side instead of the Raven, and, if it is to be accepted as a totem, hardly fits into his hypothesis according to which the phratry should be found named after an animal which is a totem on the same side.

Finally Mr Lang maintains that totemic names were originally nicknames, or names of a similar character, originally applied by outsiders and ultimately adopted by the clan itself. On this point the evidence from American tribes is again rather unfavorable. The bands of which many tribes are composed bear local names or names recording some real or supposed event in their history, or perhaps some supposed characteristic of the people. Many of these last resemble nicknames, though usually not such as attach any slight to the persons upon whom they are bestowed. Now, a few of these are names of animals or refer to animals, and we are not to exclude the possibility that bands possessing such may have evolved

into clans and the nickname into a totem. This, however, is not certainly known to have occurred. In the few cases where tribes appear to be in process of becoming totemic it is unfortunate that no nicknames involving animals appear. In all such cases a local designation is used side by side with a characteristic totem or crest which seems to be in process of replacing it, and this latter is evidently already religious in character, connected with the animistic views of nature common to all our primitive tribes.

It is unfortunate that Mr Lang had been unable to use more information from American sources. Undoubtedly we have employed terms on this side of the Atlantic with greatly varying significance, and this is often deplorable. Our failure to use a hard and fast terminology, however, is due largely to the fact that we do not find the hard and fast divisions which English theorists postulate. But even allowing for these troublesome terminologies we cannot believe that the descriptions accompanying them would have left Mr Lang altogether in doubt regarding some of the social phenomena which present themselves here. There is sufficient material in print, for instance, to set him right regarding inheritance of property in a maternal stage of society, and other bits of information to be gleaned here and there—such as a total absence of clans in half the continent of North America and their presence in the most advanced tribes—which we would cordially commend to him.

JOHN R. SWANTON.

*The Nabaloi Dialect.* By OTTO SCHEERER. *Department of the Interior. Ethnological Survey Publications.* Vol. II, part 2. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing, 1905. Pages 83-178; pl. 61-85; 6 figures.

This work, together with an account of the Bataks of the island of Palawan, by Edward T. Miller, completes Volume II of the Publications of the Ethnological Survey for the Philippine Islands. It is welcomed by everyone interested in Philippine anthropology as an important contribution to our knowledge of the primitive tribes of the archipelago, and by students of comparative philology as an interesting addition to our knowledge of the Malayan dialects of the Philippines.

Mr Scheerer was requested to make a complete study of the Ibaloi people of northern Luzon; but circumstances permitted him to perform only a part of the task assigned him—a single chapter of general information relating to the people, in addition to twenty-nine schedules, which were designed to include an extensive vocabulary of their dialect. He prepared a paper, while in Japan, on the Nabaloi dialect, giving an account of the pronunciation, together with lists of the parts of speech,